ATTENDANCE:

John Locke

Bill Collins

Mark Wankier

Bob Geilenfeldt

Foster Marshall

Daniel Cordero

Jerry Bailey

Holly Kress

Maria Gillette

Mark Peabody

Alan Clark

MR. LOCKE: I'd like to call the meeting to order. I'd like to welcome everybody to the RAB meeting.

MR. LOCKE: Did everybody have a chance to read the minutes? And if so, could I get a motion to approve?

And rolling right along, we'll jump right into the CEQA presentation by Maria Gillette.

Ms. Gillette, is with the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) out of their Sacramento office. She gave an overview of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). It is the umbrella organization of the Quality Environmental National Protection

Agency, and within this agency is also the Air Resources Board, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the Integrated Waste Management Board, Department of Pesticide Control, and the State Water Resources Control Board. Those agencies all make up the California Environmental Protection Agency.

The department is authorized with the responsibility of managing hazardous waste in California. It's granted that authority under the State Health and Safety Code and also Title 22, California Code of regulations. Furthermore, it's authorized by the United States Environmental Protection Agency under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act to permit hazardous waste management facilities.

They have four offices statewide, in Sacramento, Cypress, Berkeley, and Glendale. These four offices are comprised of Site Mitigation, Permitting, and Compliance or Enforcement branches.

CEQA is a broad environmental law. One of the things that it requires is that all public agencies in California consider, disclose, and document all the environmental implications of their actions. If a public agency is going to make a decision, they have to consider the implications of CEQA. And CEQA applies both to private activities that require government approval and to publicly funded projects.

DTSC is considered the Lead Agency. If a project is proposed, it is required to conduct environmental analysis. Based on that analysis, it will create environmental documentation and circulate it to the public for review and comments. DTSC would also hold public meetings and public hearings for the project, and respond in writing to any comments that the public gave. Finally, DTSC would certify the final environmental document.

Ms. Gillette stressed that there are certain objectives of CEQA. They are to disclose any environmental impacts the project may have, to identify any potential environmental damage that project may create, to disclose the agency's decision-making process, to foster and enhance public participation, and also to encourage intergovernmental coordination.

The first step of the process is a preliminary review. Based upon the information it receives from either the project applicant or the responsible party, it would conduct an initial study under CEQA, and this is a process where 18 different criteria are examined. Once the initial study is completed, if It doesn't appear that the project would have any impact on the environment, a negative declaration is prepared. If it appears that there might be a significant impact, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is prepared. the 18 different criteria include items such as geology, animal life, utilities, housing, air resources, land use, natural resources, public health and safety, surface and groundwater, population, plant life, cumulative effects and recreation. Once that check list has been completed, there are four findings that can be made. The first is that there's no possibility of an impact; there's some impact, significant impact but it could be mitigated, or significant impact. The last two would warrant an EIR.

If no or little impact is determined, a Negative Declaration is drafted and it's open for public scrutiny and comments. It would be put into what's called an Information Repository and the public would have 30 days in which to review these documents and provide written comments to the agency. During this 30-day period, a public meeting or a public hearing would be held to give the public an opportunity to provide written and oral comments. Those comments would then be incorporated into the document. Once that 30-day time period is over the document is finalized and, if appropriate, file a Notice of Determination with the State Clearinghouse. At that point, there's an additional 30 days that the project can be legally challenged.

If an EIR is necessary, a draft EIR if prepared for public comments over a 45-day period. Accompanying that draft EIR would be any supporting documentation. After that period of time, the document would be filed again with the State Clearinghouse. There would be a 30-day period where the project could be legally challenged.

Dr. Marshall asked, “How long does it take is I guess what I'm asking?”

Ms Gillette answered, “Ideally, CEQA is supposed to take one year, but that's not always the case.”

Mr. Collins added, “Any time we have had an emergency out here, all we've done is notify DTSC that there was a problem, and we started work immediately.”

MR. COLLINS: They'll be short.

The Site 9 update.

Site 9 was operated from the late '40s up until at least the middle '70s and which handled all types of waste. All kinds of solvents and aircraft cleaners, some fuels, metals, paint sludges, acids and bases,

all types of coatings were just dumped on the ground and allowed to soak into the soil. What didn't evaporate or soak in sometimes caught fire. The site became known as the fiery

The remedial investigation is near the end and a feasibility study is currently in process. The feasibility study looks at the types of things that would be considered in CEQA. In the feasibility some old records of some borings in the 1970s that were out in the bay were found, and it showed a little bit more of the geology at depths and they were helpful in better understanding the site.

Several new wells were put in this year, in order to get to the exact zones that were causing problems. Lastly, some porewater sampling in the sediments was done along with some benthic flux sampling. Benthic flux sampling measures contaminants that might be coming out of the sediments. It can tell in terms of pounds or kilograms how much is coming off in a year, so it gives an idea of what kind of problem is there.

Several barriers to the groundwater contaminant flow were found. The barrier caused the contaminants to migrate sideways rather than down.

One of the concerns of the first remedial investigation was that the site was faulted. It was obvious that there might be some leakage. This leakage occurred through some older wells and leaked toward the bay. The wells that were thought troublesome, were abandoned and destroyed. New wells were reinstalled to prevent any leakage.

The next problem to be addressed is the contaminated groundwater and soil. The volatile organic compounds need to be removed before the metals are treated.

MR. COLLINS: Next is Site 9 soil vapor extraction with steam injection and free product recovery,

The test site was run for six months. What was found was that the ground will hold the temperature up in the 150, 160 degree range for several weeks. The process will be to heat up one injection well to the next until the whole area is hot. This will greatly improved the ability to remove contaminants.

After six months with steam, 14,000 pounds were removed through the soil vapor extraction, plus another 14,000 pounds of contaminants came off as fuel, just by pumping the liquid out of two wells.

Over 30,000 pounds will be removed when we get the final numbers in.

Since this works very well, the full-scale system will be designed and then, working with the state, it will be installed, and then clean up the site. It is estimated that between 300,000 and 600,000 gallons of fuel was dumped there and it will take two years to get it out of the ground.

The last thing somebody asked for was an update of what's going on all over the rest of North Island. So what I did today was go in and change

At Site 1, groundwater monitoring is occurring. The Navy is trying to evaluate whether or not the placement of this large CDF with the soil fill is an adequate removal or an adequate remedy for the former contaminated bay sediments that lie below that.

Site 2, which is the old Spanish Bite Landfill, the Navy is continuing to monitor groundwater.

Site 3, a letter for No Further Action here has been received.

Site 4, the Navy cleaned up the soil at Site 4, 6, and 10 at the same time for the same reason, for PCBs in the '94-'95 time period.

The Navy has monitored the site for a year. There's no groundwater contamination at the site and that report was given to DTSC and the Water Board.

Site 5, a radiation survey will be performed in the future. A Time Critical Removal Action is currently under way and a pilot test to check out how well chemical oxidation works in destroying chlorinated compounds in groundwater and soil is being prepared.

Site 6 there's nothing going on.

At Site 7 there's no contamination left to address. The Navy is waiting to schedule it for a Record of Decision Remedial Action Plan with the state in the near future.

Site 8 is the old Weapons center bombing range. When it comes time to close down the Weapons center, DTSC has indicated that it will look at it then.

Site 10 is the site where the Navy is proposing to do one more removal action. It should take place starting this fall.

Site 12 is a closed site. It's been closed by both the State and the Water Board.

Mr. Geilenfeldt asked," What about OU 19 and 20 and the buildings that ….?"

Mr. Collins answered, "….once we have accomplished our pilot test, we will prepare removal documentation, and another CEQA document will be thrown in there. And then once that's approved, we'll go about doing the removal and cleaning up this site."

Site 11 is the Industrial Waste Treatment Plant. The Navy is in the process of preparing a Record of Decision Remedial Action Plan and also a focused Feasibility Study because this is the one site that has switched from being operated or closed under RC/RA to being closed or being cleaned up under CERCLA. Both sets of requirements need to be met.

Mr. Locke asked, "Did you talk about the rest of the outfalls?"

Mr. Collins answered, "There's an outfall at 9, 10, and then several others up here -- 5, 6, 7 and 8. Those outfalls were investigated a few years ago, and this year we finally came to an agreement with the state that no further action was necessary for those outfalls. There was no human or ecological health risk. Outfall 16 has a small problem with some metals, and we will address that this fall when we address the problem with the contamination here at the teardrop."

Mr. Geilenfeldt asked, "Bill, back up on that plume for OU19, OU20 -- OU20 specifically, that's the long rectangular plume that runs towards the STENNIS dock there. Has there ever been any determination whether that plume could possibly seep under that docking into the bay?"

Mr. Collins answered, "We have taken some recent samples up here. We think we can show that most of it has not gone that way.

Let's look at agenda items for the next meeting and the date of the next meeting.

Site 9 RI Addendum 2

is Mary Masters

MR. GEILENFELDT: So we could ask her for an evaluation.